



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,781	11/03/2000	Richard James Humpleman	SAM1.0014A	4957

7590 07/16/2003

KENNETH L SHERMAN  
SHERMAN & SHERMAN  
2029 CENTURY PARK EAST  
SEVENTEENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

(310) 789-3242

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

BASHORE, WILLIAM L

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2176  
DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

1F

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Am

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/709,781	HUMPLEMAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> William L. Bashore	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

4) Claim(s) 13-48 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 13-48 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Response to Restriction Requirement filed 4/2/2003, to the original application and pre-amendment A (paper 3), both filed 11/30/2000, said application is a division of United States Application Serial No. 09/104,297 filed 6/24/1998 (pending), with acknowledged provisional application filing dates of 9/22/1997, and **6/25/1997**. IDS filed 11/30/2000 (paper 2), and 6/11/2002 (paper 6).
2. It is noted that Applicant selects Group II claims with traverse (claims 13-48) for examination on the merits. Since Applicant presents no arguments for traverse, the examiner interprets said selection as an election without traverse.
3. Examiner acknowledges Applicant's submittal of Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 filed 12/2/2002, swearing behind the filing date of the primary reference (Corcoran et al.). It is the examiner's understanding that Applicant swears behind **June 10, 1997**.
4. The rejection of claims 9, 3-8, 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite, has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
5. The rejection of claims 9, 3-8, 10-12 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5, 8 of Humbleman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,198,479, has been withdrawn as necessitated by Terminal Disclaimer filed 12/2/2002.
6. The rejection of claims 9, 3-4, 6, 8, 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corcoran et al., and Venkatraman has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
7. The rejection of claims 5, 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corcoran, Venkatraman, and Reber has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
8. Claims 13-48 are pending. Claims 3-12, 49-76 have been canceled by Applicant. Claims 13, 22, 31, 40 are independent claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 13, 21-22, 30-31, 39-40, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, T. et al. (hereinafter Suzuki), Teleoperation of multiple robots through the Internet, 5<sup>th</sup> IEEE International Workshop on Robot and Human Communication, November 11-14, 1996, pages 84-89.**

In regard to independent claim 13, Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to Suzuki's teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 13 "*A method for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network, the method comprising the steps of:*").

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently connected robot devices via a Web browser interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4; compare with claim 13 "*(a) detecting devices that are currently connected to the home network, said devices having at least one controllable function;*").

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki also teaches a “Dialogue Window” for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - “\*\*CmCd01”, and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki does not specifically disclose menu creation for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a “Dialogue Window” for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), thus providing the claimed equivalent of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation (compare with claim 13 “(b) creating a menu for selecting said devices to activate said controllable function;”, and “(c) displaying said menu on a browser based device.”). The inclusion of a menu provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics aiding in a user’s eventual decision.

**In regard to dependent claim 21,** claim 21 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, because Suzuki teaches management of networked devices in a room. Since said devices are detected and linked regardless of end-user intervention, Suzuki’s browser interface depicting current device connections suggests autonomous linking/management of said devices, providing Suzuki the benefit of current status of linked devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

**In regard to independent claim 22,** Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to Suzuki’s teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing

Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 22 “*A method for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network, the method comprising the steps of:*”).

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently (actively) connected robot devices via a Web browser interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices. Suzuki also teaches “Robot’s Status Panel” (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4; compare with claim 22 “*(a) detecting an active state of devices that are currently connected to the home network, said devices having at least one controllable function;*”).

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki also teaches a “Dialogue Window” for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - “\*\*CmCd01”, and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki does not specifically disclose menu creation for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a “Dialogue Window” for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), thus providing the claimed equivalent of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation (compare with claim 22 “*(b) creating a menu for selecting said devices to activate said controllable function;*”, and “*(c) displaying said menu on a browser based device.*”). The inclusion of a menu provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics which aids in a user’s decision.

**In regard to dependent claim 30,** claim 30 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, because Suzuki teaches management of networked devices in a room. Since said devices are detected and linked irregardless of end-user intervention, Suzuki’s browser interface depicting current device connections suggests autonomous linking/management of said devices, providing Suzuki the benefit of current active status of linked devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

In regard to independent claim 31, Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to Suzuki's teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 31 "*A home network system for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network, the method comprising:*").

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently connected robot devices via a Web browser interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4; compare with claim 31 "*a detector that detects devices that are currently connected to the home network, said devices having at least one controllable function;*").

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki also teaches a "Dialogue Window" for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - "\*\*\*CmCd01", and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki does not specifically disclose menu creation for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), thus providing the claimed equivalent of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation (compare with claim 31 "*a menu generator for creating a menu for selecting said devices to activate said controllable function;*", and "*a browser for displaying said menu*

*on a browser based device.”). The inclusion of a menu provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics which aids in a user’s decision.*

**In regard to dependent claim 39,** claim 39 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, because Suzuki teaches management of networked devices in a room. Since said devices are detected and linked irregardless of end-user intervention, Suzuki’s browser interface depicting current device connections suggests autonomous linking/management of said devices, providing Suzuki the benefit of current status of linked devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

**In regard to independent claim 40,** Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to Suzuki’s teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 40 “*A home network system for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network, the method comprising the steps of:*”).

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently (actively) connected robot devices via a Web browser interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices. Suzuki also teaches “Robot’s Status Panel” (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4; compare with claim 40 “*(a) a detector that detects an active state of devices that are currently connected to the home network, said devices having at least one controllable function;*”).

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki also teaches a “Dialogue Window” for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - “\*\*CmCd01”, and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki does not specifically disclose menu creation for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a “Dialogue Window” for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), thus providing the claimed equivalent of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation (compare with claim 40 “*a menu generator that creates a menu for selecting said devices to activate said controllable function;*”, and “*a browser for displaying said menu on a browser based device.*”). The inclusion of a menu provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics which aids in a user’s decision.

In regard to dependent claim 48, claim 48 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, because Suzuki teaches management of networked devices in a room. Since said devices are detected and linked regardless of end-user intervention, Suzuki’s browser interface depicting current device connections suggests autonomous linking/management of said devices, providing Suzuki the benefit of current status of linked devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

11. **Claims 14-20, 23-29, 32-38, 41-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, Teleoperation of multiple robots through the Internet, 5<sup>th</sup> IEEE International Workshop on Robot and Human Communication, November 11-14, 1996, pages 84-89, in view of Venkatraman et al. (hereinafter Venkatraman), U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487 issued September 1999 (referenced in a previous action).**

**In regard to dependent claim 14,** Suzuki teaches a Web page interface (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4). Suzuki does not specifically teach a hypertext link to a web page contained within a device. However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via hyperlink (Venkatraman Abstract, also column 3 lines 17-25, 28-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Venkatraman's embedded device web page within Suzuki's menu, providing a user of Suzuki the benefit of seeing robot specific information (its embedded web page) to aid in decision making.

**In regard to dependent claim 15,** Suzuki teaches a web page showing interfacing of networked robot devices (a device link page), said page containing directional control buttons, as well as a Robot Status Panel (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

Suzuki teaches transmission of commands to a robot device, whereby upon completion of a task, said robot sends its own position/image/text data (information contained in a detected device) to be transformed into HTML for presentation in a browser interface (Suzuki page 87 left column – items 3-8, also Figure 4). Suzuki does not specifically teach a hyperlink for access to said information. However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via hyperlink (Venkatraman Abstract, also column 3 lines 17-25, 28-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Venkatraman's embedded device web page within Suzuki's link page, providing a user of Suzuki the benefit of seeing robot specific information (its embedded web page) to aid in decision making.

**In regard to dependent claim 16,** Suzuki teaches a web page showing interfacing of networked robot devices (a device link page), said page containing directional control buttons, as well as a Robot Status Panel (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

Suzuki teaches transmission of commands to a robot device, whereby upon completion of a task, said robot sends its own position/image/text data (information contained in a detected device) to be transformed into HTML for presentation in a browser interface (Suzuki page 87 left column – items 3-8, also Figure 4). Suzuki does not specifically teach a hyperlink for access to said information. However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via hyperlink (Venkatraman Abstract, also column 3 lines 17-25, 28-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Venkatraman's embedded device web page within Suzuki's link page, providing a user of Suzuki the benefit of seeing robot specific information (its embedded web page) to aid in decision making.

**In regard to dependent claim 17,** Suzuki teaches a web page depicting link control and directional buttons (a device link page) regarding identified networked robot devices, said browser web page reflective of an HTML file (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4). Suzuki also teaches a unique ID for each device, comprising group, function, equipment, type and number fields, said information (including information regarding a device's primitive tasks) stored in an Operation Database (i.e. typically an SQL file) (Suzuki page 87 right column – section 5.2.). Suzuki's system uses the database information in rendering said web page/file.

**In regard to dependent claim 18,** Suzuki teaches a designated unique ID for each robot device, which can be reasonably interpreted as a logical device name, said name stored in a database file, as well as used in rendering a web page/file (Suzuki page 87 right column – section 5.2, also Figures 4, 5).

**In regard to dependent claim 19,** Suzuki teaches a web page depicting link control and directional buttons (a device link page) regarding identified networked robot devices, said browser web page reflective of an HTML file (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4). Suzuki also teaches a unique ID for each device, comprising group, function, equipment, type and number fields, said information (including information regarding a device's

primitive tasks) stored in an Operation Database (i.e. typically an SQL file) (Suzuki page 87 right column – section 5.2.). Suzuki's system retrieves the database information file (including the robot's ID) in rendering said web page/file. Since Suzuki Figure 4 depicts a web page of specific robot images, relevant robot ID references (i.e. its logical device name) must be associated within the underlying HTML file code in order to render said images. Since the robot ID becomes associated with the "Control Panel for Individual Robot", the control buttons are converted for specific use with a specific referenced robot device (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

**In regard to dependent claim 20,** Suzuki teaches a Web page interface (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

Suzuki does not specifically teach a hypertext link to a web page contained within a device. However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via hyperlink (Venkatraman Abstract, also column 3 lines 17-25, 28-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Venkatraman's embedded device web page within Suzuki's menu, providing a user of Suzuki the benefit of seeing robot specific information (its embedded web page) to aid in decision making.

**In regard to dependent claims 23-29,** claims 23-29 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 14-20, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claims 21-38,** claims 32-38 reflect the system comprising computer executable instructions implemented by the methods as claimed in claims 14-20, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 41-47, claims 41-47 reflect the system comprising computer executable instructions implemented by the methods as claimed in claims 23-29, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

*Response to Arguments*

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 (amendment-B filed 12/2/2002 as paper 8) have been considered but are moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of said claims pursuant to election of Group II claims in Response to Restriction Requirement (filed 4/25/2003 as paper 13). Since no arguments on the merits are presented in paper 13, no response by the examiner is necessary at the present time.

It is to be respectfully noted that the instant action is made final precipitated by Applicant's addition of newly added claims 13-48 in amendment-B (paper 8), said claims selected for examination in paper 13.

*Conclusion*

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2176

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is **(703) 308-5807**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 11:30 AM to 8:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on **(703) 305-9792**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900**.

15. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

**(703) 746-7239** (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

**(703) 746-7240** (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or:

**(703) 746-7238** (for after-final communications)

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).**

William L. Bashore  
July 9, 2003



SANJIV SHAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER